THE SLAVERY QUESTION.

—o—

SPEECH

OF

HON. C. C. WASHBURN, OF WISCONSIN.

Delivered in the U. S. House of Representatives, April 26, 1860.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—

Mr. WASHBURN said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Soon after the organization of the House, I sought the floor for the purpose of replying to a speech made by my colleague [Mr. LARRABEE] during the contest for Speaker. I was desirous of correcting some of his misrepresentations, and satisfying this House and my constituents that I did not hold to one set of opinions at home and another here, as was intimated by him. When I finally obtained the floor, my colleague was absent, stumping it through the back towns of Connecticut in favor of modern Democracy; and as I did not care to speak in reply to him in his absence, I gave up my chance to my friend from Illinois, [Mr. KELLOGG,] and with it I gave up my intention of speaking altogether. But as I discover that no business is likely to be done until after the Charleston Convention is over, and that if I occupy the floor now for an hour it will in no way retard the business of the country, I will claim the attention of the Committee for a short time.

I hold in my hand a speech delivered in this House, on the 17th of December last, by my colleague from the third district in Wisconsin, [Mr. LARRABEE;] and as it was devoted somewhat to the Republican party of Wisconsin, and indirectly to his colleagues, Mr. POTTER and myself, I propose to make a few running comments upon it, as I pass along. As he is the Representative of a large and intelligent constituency, I may be pardoned for noticing what I should otherwise pass without observation.

I regret that he is not here; but when I reflect how necessary his presence was at Charleston, in order to the successful management of that Convention, and further, that the Vice Presidency is a prize not to be rashly declined without full and frank conference with friends on the spot, I do not think that he is liable to censure for leaving his seat here and going to Charleston. Such was his haste, on coming to Washington last December, to define his position, and assail a portion of the people of the State that had honored him with a seat on this floor, that he could not even wait for an organization of the House. As an excuse for occupying the time of the House, and to that extent at least for delaying its organization, he sent up and had read from the Clerk's desk the proceedings of a German meeting in Milwaukee to sympathize with John Brown, and to protest, in the name and behalf of the great majority of Germans in our State, against any allegation that such sympathy was felt by them.

Mr. Chairman, I know not to what extent the German or any other portion of the people of Wisconsin sympathize with John Brown. That there is any considerable number of persons in the State that approve of his raid into Virginia, or sympathize with his method of righting what he regarded as a great moral wrong, I do not believe; neither will I believe that there was a single person within the limits of the entire State that had any knowledge or suspicion that any such enterprise was in contemplation. I never heard a Republican, in my State or out of it, speak of the transaction without expressing the most profound regret. That there is felt in Wisconsin more or less of sympathy and admiration for certain personal traits of character exhibited by John Brown, while in prison and on the scaffold, it would be folly to deny. Those traits of character were such as to challenge the admiration of Governor Wise himself, who pronounced him the "bravest man, the most truthful man, and the most sincere man," he ever knew. It is not strange,

then, that the qualities which so much struck Governor Wise should excite sympathy everywhere, where bravery, sincerity, and truth, are regarded. I presume that the German population of Wisconsin participate more or less in that feeling. They are generally opposed to the institution of slavery, and to the extension of slavery. Very many of them act with the Republican party; and I doubt not that they would nearly all do so, were it not that in our State the Democratic party has, to a great extent, persuaded them that they were the real friends of freedom, free soil, and free men, and that the most effectual way to prevent the further extension of slavery was to vote the Democratic ticket.

As they learn our language, however, very readily, they soon begin to read for themselves, and, as they do so, generally become Republicans; and, sooner or later, the great mass of Germans will belong to the Republican party. Southern men and slaveholders understand this perfectly well, and hence it is that they look with such horror upon the ingress of Germans into the free States. They see that the effect must be to increase the power and influence of free labor, and thus render more speedy and certain the result of that "irrepressible conflict," which always has existed and always will exist, between free and slave labor. It is this sentiment, in regard to that class of population, that renders the South nearly unanimous against that much-desired Republican measure, a homestead bill, and which has led a Democratic Senate to substitute for the House bill one depriving foreigners of its benefits. It is in vain for my colleague to endeavor to persuade his Southern friends here that the Germans of Wisconsin are in favor of slavery or slavery extension. Southern politicians are not easily imposed upon by protestations of Northern men, which they know have no foundation in reason; and Northern men who set out to prove to them that the North is not opposed to the further extension of slavery, generally end in winning the contempt of those they endeavor to deceive. The German population of Wisconsin, taken as a body, are intelligent, industrious, loyal, and patriotic. Among them may be found some of the most brilliant and highly-cultivated minds of which the country can boast. They have contributed largely to the wealth, power, and prosperity of the State, and to their honor I speak, what my colleague dare not deny, *they are opposed to slavery and slavery extension.*

As my colleague represents a larger foreign-born constituency than any other gentleman here, and a constituency generally opposed to slavery and slavery extension, I will leave him to explain to that constituency the reason why he gratuitously declared on this floor, during the contest for Speaker, that he was ready to leave his own party, and vote for a member of the Southern American party, in order to defeat the Republican candidate for Speaker, and afterwards did so vote. Will his reason be, that the South American party entertained views more nearly akin to those of his constituents than the Republicans? What are the views of the South Americans, that rendered my colleague so eager to declare that he would vote for any one of their number for Speaker? Many of them believe that the Constitution of the United States carries slavery into all our Territories, and that it is the duty of Congress to pass laws to protect it there. They also believe that our Government is in danger from the introduction of foreigners; and are in favor, as I understand, of increasing the time required for their naturalization. These are the main points of difference between the Americans and Republicans; and because of these points of difference, my colleague so much prefers a South American to a Republican. I cannot but think that it was rather hard, after he had shown himself such a "willing soul," that the South Americans would not honor him with a single vote for Speaker in return. It was very ungrateful. Yet I observe, by a leading Democratic paper at Milwaukee, that he had a very narrow escape from the Speaker's chair; and that it was only in consequence of his exceeding modesty that he was not elected. He had only to consent to the use of his name, and the thing was done. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. Chairman, I pass to consider another portion of my colleague's speech. He told the House that he was an Anti-Lecompton Democrat; but that issue being dead, he had buried it, and that there was no division among the Democracy of Wisconsin. They were all Democrats, and supporters of the National Administration. Now, this does not accord with my understanding of the matter; and, I think, is slightly erroneous, particularly in regard to their being all supporters of the National Administration.

When my colleague says that he buried the Lecompton issue, I can assure him that the people have neither buried nor forgotten it, nor forgiven the men who raised that issue. They know that such issues may again arise; and he need not be surprised to find himself entombed, instead of the Lecompton issue. What was that issue of which my colleague seems to be so much ashamed and so anxious to forget, and strike hands with the perpetrators of that iniquity? No more nor less than an attempt to force upon an unwilling people a Constitution which they had no part in forming; a Constitution absolutely hateful to them, and authorizing the institution of slavery. The whole power of this Administration, with which my colleague is now so much in love, was brought to bear to force that Constitution upon the people of Kansas.

An outrage so great, that at a meeting of Democrats at Janesville, Wisconsin, to denounce it, in December, 1857, my colleague

declared, (and I use the language he is reported to have used,) that were he a "Kansas Dem-
'ocrat, he would not submit to the Lecompton
'Constitution; that he would say that he was
'not slave enough to submit to such a dicta-
'tion from Washington."

Brave words were those, adapted to the latitude of Wisconsin; but how unlike any language he has uttered here in the hearing of the slave power.

Does my colleague not know, that had he proclaimed it on the stump when he was a candidate, that he had forgotten and forgiven Mr. Buchanan's complicity with the Lecompton outrage, he would not be here? Does he not know that one of the reasons why he was nominated, was because he had made himself conspicuous in denouncing the President's Lecompton policy?

My colleague has a great fancy for seeing himself in print. He is also fond of a joke. His last effort in that line is to be found in a late letter of his, in reply to a letter of Hon. Thomas Green Davidson, addressed to his constituents. Mr. Davidson had charged that the friends of Judge Douglas were engaged in playing a game of "brag." This was denied by my colleague, and in the course of his denial he uses this language:

"The writer of this communication professes
'to know, and does know, a good deal more of
'Northern Democratic sentiment than Mr.
'Davidson has had an opportunity of ascer-
'taining; and he ventures to say that Judge
'Douglas can carry, if nominated at Charles-
'ton, the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinios,
'Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, and, in all prob-
'ability, Michigan; that he can carry the State
'of New York, the State of Connecticut, and
'the Administration will unquestionably aid
'the nominee of the Convention to carry tri-
'umphantly the State of Pennsylvania. Mr.
'Davidson's 'deliberate conviction,' so far as
'Northern sentiment is concerned, is simply a
'very great mistake, and he will sooner or later
'discover his error."

If this does not afford a rich fund for amusement to men of all parties in Wisconsin, I mistake their appreciation of fun. His reputation as a "joker" will certainly remain undiminished. Talk about Douglas, or any other Democrat, carrying Wisconsin. Why, sir, there is no future event so utterly improbable. As my colleague has prophesied largely, I may be indulged slightly. But I will not undertake to speak for any but my own State, and I will venture to put on record the prediction, that if William H. Seward, or any other tried Republican, is nominated at Chicago, the second Congressional district will roll up a Republican majority of fifteen thousand, and the entire State a majority of twenty-five thousand.

My colleague said, in his speech, that he had been "astonished," since he came here, to hear gentlemen, who were Democrats, charging the Administration of Mr. Buchanan with being "wicked, corrupt, and infamous." "Why, sir," said he, with a degree of innocent simplicity truly refreshing, "if this be so, I have learned the fact for the first time." Where can he have been for the last two years, that he should be in such a state of blissful ignorance? I respectfully recommend to this modern Rip Van Winkle, that he should wake up long enough to read the reports of the Naval investigating committee, the Willet's Point committee, and the Fort Snelling committee, of the last Congress. He told us that he would vote for a South American for Speaker, and did so vote; and yet there is hardly one of those gentlemen but what, at the time he made that declaration and at the time he voted for one, had stated, in their places here, that the present Administration was the most corrupt that had ever existed since the foundation of the Government.

With what humility he alludes to the fact of his having been snubbed by the President, and his recommendations disregarded, will be seen in the following extract:

"I always yield to the President of the Uni-
'ted States the highest possible respect. I en-
'tertain those sentiments to-day for the present
'occupant of the Presidential chair, and it mat-
'ters not to me whether he recognises me as a
'Democrat or not, in the mere distribution of
'paltry Federal offices. No man should visit
'his mere personal grievances on his party."

If there is not a bright and shining example of meekness, I do not know what meekness is.

Mr. Chairman, Patrick Henry, of Virginia, once said that—

"There were periods in the history of man
'when corruption and depravity have so long
'debased the human character, that man sinks
'under the weight of the oppressor's hand, and
'becomes his servile, his abject slave. He licks
'the hand that smites him."

I pass for a moment to consider my colleague's declaration, that the Republican party is a sectional party. Why sectional? What are the aims and objects of the Republican party? Simply to restrain the extension of slavery into territory now free. If that makes the party sectional, it is so; for that is the unalterable purpose of the Republican party. They believe, as did the men who founded our Government, that slavery is an evil, not to be extended and nurtured; and that as Congress was always recognised prior to 1850 as having entire control of this question of slavery extension in the Territories, so ought it to legislate to prevent the extension of this great evil. They believe, as was declared a few years ago by the Democracy of Pennsylvania, "that it
'formed no part of the compromises of the Con-
'stitution that slavery should forever travel with
'the advancing column of our territorial prog-
'ress." All the constitutional rights of the

South, and of all sections of the Union, they are determined to maintain at all hazards.

But he says we are sectional, because a great leader in the Republican party [Mr. SEWARD] has declared that there was an "irrepressible conflict" between the "North and the South." Mr. SEWARD has never made the declaration, that there was any conflict between the North and the South, and my colleague certainly must know it. Inasmuch as this term, "irrepressible conflict," is made a bugbear to frighten the ignorant and timid, I will read just what Mr. SEWARD said, in his celebrated Rochester speech, upon that subject:

"Hitherto, the two systems have existed in 'different States, side by side, within the 'American Union." * * * "These an-'tagonistic systems are continually coming 'into closer contact, and collision results. 'Shall I tell you what this collision means? 'They who think that it is accidental, unne-'cessary—the work of interested or fanatical 'agitators, and therefore ephemeral—mistake 'the case altogether. It is an irrepressible 'conflict between opposing and enduring 'forces, and it means that the United States 'must, and will, sooner or later, become en-'tirely a slaveholding nation, or entirely a free-'labor nation."

Never was a greater truth uttered by mortal man than this by Mr. SEWARD. He asserted what every intelligent man knows to be true, that involuntary labor is antagonistic to free labor, and hence they are in conflict; and as the two systems are, and always must be, in conflict, the Republican party is determined to lessen that conflict as much as possible, by refusing to extend the system of involuntary labor.

But, Mr. Chairman, Mr. SEWARD, the evil genius of Democracy, as he is now regarded, never uttered any sentiment on this slave question more objectionable to the South and to the friends of slavery, than George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, or James Madison; and if either of those great men were now living, their persons would be unsafe to-day on the soil of Virginia. Why, sir, it is but a few days ago that a distinguished son of Virginia, and the author of a history of that ancient Commonwealth, Hon. R. R. Howison, in a letter to Bayard Taylor, excusing his withdrawal of an invitation to lecture before a literary association in Richmond, declared that the opinions of Washington upon slavery were contrary to "Scripture and reason," and that Jefferson, if now living, "would not be a welcome visiter in a Virginia community."

This is no doubt true, and it is, to say the least of it, candid in the historian to avow it, however discreditable the fact may be. It is lamentable to contemplate the inroads that have been made upon the moral sense of that section of our country in the last few years. It is but a few years ago, that this same historian wrote and printed, in his History of Virginia, that

"The last and most important cause unfa-'vorably affecting Virginia, which we shall 'mention, is the existence of slavery within 'her bounds."

And this:

"We apprehend that, in general, the people 'of Virginia hold slavery to be an enormous 'evil, bearing with fatal power on their pros-'perity."

Mr. Chairman, too much honor is conferred on Mr. SEWARD, great, wise, benevolent, patriotic, and far seeing, as he is, in attributing to him the authorship of this "irrepressible conflict" sentiment. Mr. Calhoun had before declared the same thing. Kentucky's noblest son, the lion-hearted Clay, in 1827, before the American Colonization Society, spoke as follows:

"If they would repress all tendencies to-'wards liberty and ultimate emancipation, they 'must do more than put down the benevolent 'efforts of this society. They must go back 'to the era of our liberty and independence, 'and muzzle the cannon which thunders its 'annual joyous return. They must revive the 'slave trade, with all its train of atrocities. 'They must suppress the workings of British 'philanthropy, seeking to ameliorate the con-'dition of the unfortunate West Indian slaves. 'They must arrest the career of South Ameri-'can deliverance from thraldom. They must 'blow out the moral lights around us, and ex-'tinguish the greatest torch of all, which 'America presents to a benighted world, point-'ing the way to their rights, their liberties, 'and their happiness. And when they have 'achieved all these purposes, their work will 'be yet incomplete. They must penetrate the 'human soul, and eradicate the light of reason 'and the love of liberty. Then, and not until 'then, when universal darkness and despair 'prevail, can you perpetuate slavery, *and re-'press all sympathies* and all humane and be-'nevolent efforts among freemen in behalf of 'the unhappy portion of our race who are 'doomed to bondage."—*Tenth Annual Report of Colonization Society.*

Sir, this conflict will continue until you "penetrate the human soul, and eradicate the light of reason and the love of liberty."

My colleague charges that the Republican party of Wisconsin are inimical to the rights of the South. I deny it. I deny that they are opposed to the just rights of any man, or any section of this Union. That they are opposed to the fugitive slave law, and declare it to be unconstitutional, is no doubt true. The people of Wisconsin generally, without distinction of party, regretted the passage of the fugitive slave law. The entire delegation in Congress at the time opposed that law. Both Senators were sound Democrats, and two of

the three Representatives; but they knew the sentiment of their constituents, and unanimously opposed the law. The people of the State, then as now, regard the law as a most inhuman one, and a disgrace to the statute book of a free, enlightened Christian country. The Supreme Court of the State has declared it to be unconstitutional; and, in doing so, pronounced an opinion which, in my judgment, is unanswerable.

While the people are opposed to the law, they will not resist its execution, neither will they help to execute it, but will leave that dirty work to the officers of the Federal Government, and such Democrats as like to engage in it. It is a species of work that must be repulsive to every honorable mind, and work that Henry Clay once said no *gentleman* would engage in.

I do not deny, Mr. Chairman, that the fugitive slave law is particularly offensive to the people of my State. To their honor I state, that they generally detest that law. There has never been but one attempt to enforce it within the limits of Wisconsin, but that was under circumstances of great atrocity. The forbearance of the people on that occasion was remarkable. Great as was the excitement and indignation felt at the time, the slave hunter escaped unharmed, and the fugitive departed for Canada. A citizen of Milwaukee, who rode through the streets and announced to the people that a man was about to be kidnapped, was indicted by the United States District Court, and, with a packed jury of Democrats, was convicted and sentenced to pay a fine of $1,000, and be imprisoned for thirty days, and until the fine was paid. The United States custom-house at Milwaukee was converted into a prison, and the alleged rescuer is now held there a close prisoner, guarded by a small army of Government officials, for fear of a rescue, at an expense to the public of over $100 per day. So long as the Government think it profitable to keep him there, at an expense of thirty or forty thousand dollars a year, and we vote the money, I suppose he will remain.

It is but just that my colleague should have the full benefit which a knowledge of his position will give him with his Southern friends, and for that reason I state, what I know nothing but his modesty prevented him from stating, that in a discussion with me last fall, one year after he had been elected to the office he now holds, he stated, in answer to interrogatories from me, that if he had been in Congress in 1850 he would have voted for the fugitive slave law. He also stated that he would help to execute it; and also, that had he been in Congress in 1854, he would have voted for the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and repeal of the Missouri compromise line—an act which, I believe, is now almost universally regretted, and is looked upon as the Pandora's box from which has sprung all our present ills. It may be proper to remark here, that the Democratic member who represented, in 1854, the district which my colleague now represents, was elected by a majority of some seven thousand votes. He dodged on that bill, and at the next election his constituents placed the seal of condemnation upon him by a majority of three thousand—thus showing, in a most unmistakable manner, their condemnation of the act. And yet his successor declared that he would have voted for it. Could contempt for the will of a constituency further go? Let him take warning from the fate of that predecessor.

I mention these things, and help my colleague to define his position, because I know that it will greatly improve his *status* here, and may be the means of the President removing from him the ban under which he was placed after his vociferous participation in the Anti-Lecompton meeting at Janesville, Wisconsin, during the pending of the Lecompton controversy, to which I have before alluded. This knowledge will certainly establish his claim to being a national man and a patriot.

My colleague says that we will not deny that the Republican party are opposed to the fugitive slave law, and the admission of any more slave States; but, says he, "when they come here, they take back those words, and say that they meant nothing;" and in proof of the declaration, he triumphantly inquired "if anybody had got up on our side of the House to represent the views of Horace Greeley?" Well, I should rather think not. I am not aware that Mr. Greeley has asked anybody to expound his views here. I fancy that he feels competent to speak for himself. But if he means to say that his Republican colleagues express or entertain opinions at home that they do not here, it is not true. When I am asked, here or elsewhere, if I approve of or will turn out to help execute the fugitive slave law, I answer emphatically, "No." When I said to my constituents at home, that under no conceivable case would I vote for the admission of another slave State into this Union, I meant just what I said. This question of the admission of States I regard as one of discretion entirely. That discretion members are often called upon to exercise. At the last session of Congress, I voted against the admission of Oregon, a free State, for reasons that were satisfactory to me; and yet I have never heard it alleged that myself and the gentlemen who voted with me violated our constitutional obligations in doing so.

What is there, then, more sacred about a slave State, that should deprive me of the use of that discretion and judgment which I am allowed to use in regard to the admission of a free State? In the admission of Minnesota into the Union, several Southern members voted against the admission because aliens were allowed to vote; and yet they were not reproached with trespassing upon any constitu-

tional right. If a Southern man votes against the admission of a free State because her Constitution allows aliens to vote, it is all right in the estimation of the Democracy; but if a Northern man votes against the admission of a State because her Constitution allows slavery, the whole pack of Northern doughfaces open out in full cry, and declare that you have violated your oath to support the Constitution. From this it may readily be seen in how much higher estimation is held the right of the people in the new States to hold human beings in perpetual bondage, than of the same States to secure the privilege of voting to citizens of foreign birth; such is modern Democracy. I may be pardoned for a few words more upon this question of the admission of more slave States.

Mr. Chairman, what says the Constitution in regard to the admission of new States into this Union? The following is its language upon that subject:

"New States may be admitted by the Con-
' gress into this Union; but no new State shall
' be formed or erected within the jurisdiction
' of any other State; nor any State formed by
' the junction of two or more States, or parts of
' States, without the consent of the Legislatures
' of the States concerned, as well as of the Con-
' gress."

The above is all the Constitution says on the subject.

New States may be admitted. Nowhere does it declare that new States shall be admitted, regardless of all other considerations, except the requisite population, and a Constitution republican in form. A fair construction of that clause of the Constitution clearly leaves the question entirely in the discretion of Congress.

Could there be any doubt as to the construction of this clause, I would quote some opinions upon the subject of some of our wisest men who have expressed themselves upon it. I will, however, quote the opinion of but one man, and he a man whose authority upon a question of constitutional law will be regarded as the very highest that could be invoked. I need not say that I allude to the "great expounder of the Constitution," Daniel Webster.

In the year 1837, Mr. Webster, in a speech at Niblo's Garden, in New York, discussed the slave question at length, and spoke of the *danger of its extension.* After remarking that Congress had no power over it in the States already in the Union, he spoke as follows:

"But when we come to speak of admitting
' new States, the subject assumes an entirely
' different aspect. The free States, and all the
' States, are then at liberty to accept or reject.
' When it is proposed to admit new members
' into this political partnership, the old mem-
' bers have the right to say on what terms such
' new partners are to come in, and what they
' are to bring along with them."

In the Senate of the United States, in 1848, when discussing the Oregon bill, Mr. Webster said:

"I have said that I shall consent to no ex-
' tension of the area of slavery on this conti-
' nent, nor to any increase of slave representa-
' tion in the other House of Congress. I have
' now stated my reasons for my conduct and
' my vote. We of the North have already gone
' in this respect far beyond all that any South-
' ern man could have expected, or did expect
' at the time of the adoption of the Constitution.
' I repeat the statement of the fact of the cre-
' ation of five new slaveholding States out of
' newly-acquired territory. We have done that
' which, if those who framed the Constitution
' had foreseen, they never would have agreed
' to slave representation."

The speech from which I have just quoted concludes with the following emphatic words:

"I have made up my mind, for one, that un-
' der no circumstances will I consent to the
' further extension of slavery in the United
' States, or to the further increase of slave rep-
' resentation in the House of Representatives."

And in his famous 7th of March speech, in 1850, he expressed the same sentiments in the following language:

"It has happened, that between 1837 and
' this time, on various occasions I have ex-
' pressed my entire opposition to the admission
' of new slave States or the acquisition of slave
' Territories to be added to the United States.
' I know, sir, no change in my own sentiments
' or my own purposes in this respect."

The same idea, only in stronger language, was subsequently expressed by him in a speech in Buffalo in 1851; but I have not time to quote it, or to dwell longer on this subject.

My colleague says that he "once had respect for the Republican organization." I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Republicans will feel bad when they come to hear that he respects them no longer. He did not inform us when he withdrew from the Republican party that which is so necessary to its reputable existence—*his* respect. I suppose the time when he respected the Republican party was the time when the Democratic party of Wisconsin occupied the same position on the slave question that we then and now occupy. Because the Republican party has not changed position with the Democracy on this question, it has forfeited his respect. Sad calamity! But before he proclaims his want of respect for the Republican party, he had better give his Southern friends some reason for his party's changing front. They distrust all those who make so radical a change as from freedom to slavery; and they want a reason, and a good one, before they will believe in its sincerity; and they want to know why it is that the Democracy of Wisconsin, a few years ago, laid down, in solemn State Convention, a platform of principles which he now repudiates.

The following are some of the resolutions passed at that Convention:

"*Resolved*, That we are opposed to the extension of slavery into territory now free.

"*Resolved*, That we are opposed to the admission of any new States into this Union, the Constitution or laws of which create or sustain slavery.

"*Resolved*, That all national laws which sustain or recognise slavery, except where the institution exists as a distinct State right, should be repealed.

"*Resolved*, That we believe it to be the duty of Congress to incorporate the provisions of the ordinance of 1787, prohibiting slavery or involuntary servitude, into all Territorial organic acts hereafter to be passed, and to oppose the admission into the Union of any more slave States."

Now, I think that Southern gentlemen will agree with me, that it comes with an ill-grace for a gentleman, the platform of whose party was embraced in these resolutions, to boast of his want of respect for a party which entertains the same opinions that his party taught. The great majority of the gentleman's constituents are to-day opposed to slavery and slavery extension; and Mr. IVERSON was right when he declared in the Senate, the other day, that he had no confidence in the protestations of Northern doughfaces, that the North was sound on the slave question. He declared his belief that the Democracy of the North was "rotten" on that question. If rottenness consists in their opposition to slavery, they are rotten.

I have three times canvassed my district as a candidate for Congress, and on each occasion my opponent has claimed to be a better and more decided opponent to slavery than I was, and contended that the policy of the Democratic party was better calculated to prevent the spread of slavery than the policy of the Republican party, and that the object of the Kansas-Nebraska bill was to give the North advantages it did not before have. This ground was distinctly taken in our late gubernatorial election, which took place since the raid of John Brown into Virginia, as I will show, before I close, from a *verbatim* report of a speech made by Hon. H. C. Hobart, the late Democratic candidate for Governor in Wisconsin, which speech was repeated many times in different parts of the State.

He succeeded well in persuading the people that the Democratic party was really the party most opposed to the extension of slavery; and it is not unlikely that he would have been elected, had not my colleague, in an evil hour, taken the stump for him. He came into my district, the largest district in point of population of any in the Union; a district which, at the late fall election, polled over fifty-four thousand votes; a district which is bounded on the west, for a distance of three hundred miles, by the mighty "Father of Waters," and on the north by the largest inland sea in the world, and commenced preaching a new doctrine. As he passed along the astonished land, the unterrified Democracy stood aghast, and many hung their heads from very shame.

They had not been in the habit of hearing their stump orators eulogize slavery as a good thing, or members of Congress proclaim their love for the fugitive slave law, and trumpet to the world their eagerness for a chance to testify actively their admiration of that enactment. The result was, that in one Senatorial district canvassed by my colleague, which elected a Democratic State Senator two years ago, by several hundred majority, a Republican was chosen at the late election by about four hundred majority. In the other district visited by my colleague, which elected a Democratic Senator two years ago, by about three hundred majority, a Republican was chosen by a majority of over eleven hundred. Thus the Republicans, by the teachings of my colleague, gained two State Senators, and about two thousand votes, in two Senatorial districts alone. Could he have gone through the State, and repeated the same speech that he spoke in my district, I have no doubt that, instead of the Republican party having a majority of four thousand in the State, they would have had a majority of twenty thousand.

My colleague favored the House and the country with a disquisition upon the different races of men. He does not believe in the unity of the human race, and claims to be the inventor of a new idea. He thinks that St. Paul was slightly mistaken when he stood upon Mars Hill, and declared to the haughty Athenians, that "God had created of one blood all nations of men, to dwell on the face of the earth." He doubtless belongs to that class of plilosophers that Hudibras speaks of:

> "Some philosophers of late here
> Write men have four legs by nature;
> And that 'tis custom makes them go
> Erroneously upon but two."

In support of his theory of plurality of races, my colleague has made the wonderful discovery that the African race is the most affectionate of beings, from which he deduces the conclusion that he was made to be enslaved. That the affections do largely predominate in the African race, is no doubt true; and because it is so, because in all the relations of husband and wife, parent and child, they feel more deeply than others, he makes it a reason for upholding and extending an institution which disregards all the ties of affection, tears asunder husband and wife, parent and child, and consigns them to a life of perpetual bondage. Because this race, according to my colleague, possesses the gentlest of sensibility, is a reason with him why these sensibilities should be taxed to the utmost power of human endurance. Because they are affectionate and docile, he would trample them under his feet. But, Mr. Chair-

man, I have heard this discourse upon the races before; indeed, I have heard that same speech in the main more than once before. I always did like that speech. It did us great good in Wisconsin at the last election, as I have already said. The gentleman also spoke the same piece, I am informed, through Minuesota, during the late canvass there, and helped our friends, as I am assured, to many thousand Republican votes; and in behalf of the Republicans of that young and growing State, I now publicly thank him for the good he did our cause there.

My friends from Connecticut in this House inform me that the same old speech did duty up there at their late election, much to the advantage of the Republicans. I believe that, in most of the towns where he spoke, the Republicans rolled up increased majorities. The old pro-slavery deacons up there were considerably set back by his discourse on the races.

My colleague says that the black man is out of place on the earth when in contact with the white man. I agree with him; the Republican party agrees with him. And because he is so out of place, we propose keeping him out of the free Territories, and not allowing him, with his unpaid labor, to come in contact with white men and white labor. But he inquires, "what are you to do with them?" I answer, that we propose to prevent their increase as much as possible, by refusing to open new Territories to be despoiled by them, and by colonizing, in Central or South America, such free blacks as are willing to go there, according to the plan elaborated by Francis P. Blair, jun., and our colleague in the other end of the Capitol, [Senator DOOLITTLE]—a plan which I heartily approve, as the best, if not only, solution of the question of "what are you to do with them?"

But this question of slavery in the Territories is purely an abstract question, says my colleague; and he asks if the Republicans have attempted to carry it out in either branch of Congress in the last four years. I am not aware, Mr. Chairman, that any Territory has been organized by Congress in the last four years; consequently, there has been no occasion for the introduction of any proviso upon that subject; but, sir, the gentleman's declaration that the question was an abstraction, and not likely to arise, was answered at the time, considerably to his discomfiture, by one of his own political friends, Mr. UNDERWOOD, of Georgia, who showed him how the question was likely to arise at this very session, in a bill to organize Arizona and other Territories. But, sir, were it true that every inch of territory now belonging to the United States had been provided with immutable laws forever prohibiting slavery, the mission of the Republican party would not cease, nor will it cease until there is no more foreign territory to be acquired by this Government. It requires no extraordinary foresight to predict that, sooner or later, all of Mexico and Central America, to the Isthmus of Panama, will be overrun and annexed to these United States. Sir, such annexation is as certain as the march of time, and cannot be prevented unless you radically change the character of our people.

The disposition of our people, if not absolutely aggressive, is to enlarge our possessions and extend our borders, and the Republican party will have all it can attend to hereafter in fixing the terms of annexation of foreign territory. They will consent to no extension of territory, unless the system of slavery shall be forever prohibited therein. My colleague, Mr. Chairman, is a law-abiding man, and, if we are to believe his protestations, a great lover of the Constitution. He is distressed beyond measure at the idea of any one at the North being opposed to the fugitive slave law; yet, will it be believed that this Constitution-and-law-abiding man declared here, in his place, that if he lived in a Southern Territory, he would laugh to scorn all laws of Congress prohibiting slavery there? He went further, and as far as any Northern man was ever known to go, and declared that if he lived in a Southern Territory, among Southern men, he would own slaves himself, and that he should consider it right for him to do so. He says that he "would take those servants, and expend upon them his energies and intellect to train and protect them." Now, what my colleague meant by saying that he would expend his "energies and intellect" in training those sable children, is left in a little doubt. We know that the laws of the slave States do not permit him to educate his slave; consequently, he could not mean that he was going to expend his intellect in their education.

Necessarily, then, the training he speaks of must mean that which would extort the largest amount of labor in the shortest possible space of time; and should Sambo slightly flag under this intellectual training of my colleague, then, I suppose, he proposes to expend his "energies" to quicken his sluggish motions, and enliven his lazy, indolent limbs, and thus would he "do his duty before God to those placed under his care and guidance." For all these blessings showered upon him by my colleague, ought not the poor chattel to be duly thankful? What less return can he make, for having been charitably taken from a wild, idle, savage people in Africa, and generously provided with plenty of reputable hard work, in a genteel, polished, tender, and Christian country?

I am glad that my colleague defined his position in regard to the rights of slaveholders in the Territories. He concedes that they have the right to go there with their slaves, and that neither Congress nor the people of a Territory have the right to exclude them, so long as they remain a Territory. This doctrine, so unlike that which I have heard avowed by Democratic stump orators in Wisconsin other than him,

and advocated by the Democratic press of that State, may strike some with surprise; but I am not of that number. He knows that the position assumed in his speech on this question—namely, that the Southern man has the right to go into the Territories and take his slave, and hold him there in the absence of law, and in defiance of the will of the people, is not the position of the Democratic party of Wisconsin; and his making the concession he does, in this regard, should convince every reasonable mind that there is no exaction which Southern men choose to make, that he will not at all times be ready to concede. If Southern men have the right, as my colleague admits they have, under the Constitution, to take their slaves to a Territory, I ask if they have not the right to have them protected there; and if the Territorial Legislature fails to protect them, are they not entitled to a law of Congress to protect them?

Mr. Chairman, I have already said that the Democratic party of Wisconsin claimed to be more sound on the question of the non-extension of slavery than the Republican, and that for that reason they obtained a large number of German votes. In proof of it, I have already read several Democratic resolutions. But those resolutions were passed several years ago, and it may be alleged that they do not now represent the real sentiment of the Democracy of that State. In proof that they do, I beg leave to read some authorities. The Democratic party of Wisconsin placed in nomination last fall, as their candidate for Governor, and exponent of their principles, Hon. Harrison C. Hobart. Mr. Hobart canvassed a considerable portion of the State, and addressed the people. He met his opponent, Governor Randall, and they discussed, on many occasions, the principles of their respective parties. At one of these discussions, a political friend of Mr. Hobart, the editor of the Milwaukee *News*, sent out a stenographer, and had the speeches of both parties reported *verbatim*, and printed them in his paper. I have the paper here. Governor Randall charged the Democratic party with inconsistency, and being untrue to the principles which they had before inculcated, which principles were such as were embodied in the resolutions I have heretofore read. Mr. Hobart indignantly repelled the imputation. He stated that the Democratic party was then as much opposed to slavery as in 1849, when they passed those resolutions; and the only reason why they did not reiterate these doctrines was because they had discovered a new principle by which slavery could be more effectually excluded from the Territories than by the Wilmot proviso, and that new principle was "squatter sovereignty." But I will let Mr. Hobart speak for himself. He said:

"In 1849, the Democratic party, as my friend ' states, did pass resolutions of the kind he ' read, which we regarded as enunciating prin- ' ciples that ought to be carried out. There are ' many of you present, gentlemen, who were ' members of the Democratic party in 1849, ' and I will ask you, if, on this subject of ' slavery, we have retrograded—if we have ' proved false in any degree to the views ' we then entertained? And I ask your candid ' attention, as thinking men; I speak not for ' applause, but I address myself to you ear- ' nestly, desiring to recommend what I say to ' your minds and consciences.

"'In 1849 we declared that, in the organiza- ' tion of a Territory, the Wilmot proviso, as it ' was then called, or a proviso prohibiting sla- ' very, should be attached to the organic act. ' It was the belief of all parties in this country ' that the power of legislation on the subject of ' slavery in the Territories was vested in Con- ' gress. Every one thought it a proper tribu- ' nal to determine as to the introduction or pro- ' hibition of slavery. Both parties at that time ' thought the power was vested in Congress. I ' appeal to you if your own memory does not ' confirm what I say, that that was the princi- ' ple on which we acted, and that, believing in ' that principle, we were then in favor of pro- ' hibition. That was the voice of the Democ- ' racy in 1849. We declared that if Congress ' was to determine the question of slavery in ' the Territories, we were in favor of its pro- ' hibiting it by the passage of the Wilmot pro- ' viso.

"Gentlemen, since then a considerable time ' has elapsed, and how do we stand now? You ' will follow me while I briefly allude to our ' present position on this question, and then I ' will attempt to demonstrate that we have not ' changed our views, *but are now as radically, ' and more practically, anti-slavery than ever ' before.* Two thirds of the argument of my ' friend is just as applicable to one party as to ' the other. We entertain no new doctrine or ' sentiment, but the same principle that we ' have always entertained. In the present cam- ' paign, we have declared certain principles in ' Convention, and that declaration, we think, is ' entitled to respect, unless we trample upon ' the principles there announced, by declaring ' one thing and acting another. Where do we ' stand? We have recently adopted a principle ' which was not in existence, or, at least, was ' not entertained to any great extent, in 1849— ' that instead of having Congress pass upon ' this question, we will turn it over to the ex- ' clusive control of the inhabitants of the Ter- ' ritories themselves. Instead of allowing the ' two or three hundred men who meet at Wash- ' ington, and make laws for the country, to ' manage the affairs of a distant Territory, we ' will leave that power in the hands of the act- ' ual settlers of the Territory.

"That is the view, and that is the position ' of the Democratic party at the present mo- ' ment. [Applause.] Formerly, when the power ' was supposed to reside in Congress, and we ' had to act upon it, we came square to the

'mark, and instructed our members of Con-
'gress to vote for prohibition. Now, we are in
'favor of removing the question entirely from
'the Halls of Congress, and of leaving it to the
'people themselves. [Applause, and cries
'of 'Good!' 'Good!'] Gentlemen, have we
'changed or become more pro-slavery by re-
'moving this vexatious question from the Halls
'of Congress, and placing it in the hands of the
'people? That is the simple question to which
'I ask your earnest attention. Have we changed
'our anti-slavery notions or views by advocating
'the policy of leaving this power with the set-
'tlers of the Territories themselves, instead of
'the politicians at Washington? Is liberty not
'as safe in the hands of the people who settle
'the Territory, and are more interested in its
'welfare than all the rest of the world, as in
'the hands of the Federal Legislature at Wash-
'ington?"

I presume my colleague will not dispute that Mr. Hobart was good authority, and that his views of the present position of the Democratic party of Wisconsin are correct. He was supported by the united Democracy of the State, my colleague included, who stumped the State for him; and the Democracy, in voting for him, thought that they were voting for a stanch anti-slavery man. Mr. Hobart excused himself and party for having abandoned the resolutions of 1849, by dodging behind "squatter sovereignty." But, thank God, that dodge cannot avail them much longer. Squatter sovereignty is about played out. It is no doubt true, as Mr. Hobart said, that the Democrats of Wisconsin believed that this newly-discovered squatter-sovereignty doctrine was going to do more for the cause of freedom than the Wilmot proviso. But all the signs from Charleston, up to the moment I now speak, indicate that, whoever may be nominated there, squatter sovereignty is to be repudiated. As that has been the entire stock in trade of the Northern Democracy, I am a little curious to see what will be the next expedient they will resort to, to let themselves down easy, and again humbug the people.

That the people will follow longer after that *ignis fatuus* is hardly possible to believe. At the late Democratic interpretation of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, as given in the President's message, some of the most independent Democrats of Wisconsin revolt. The Honorable Charles D. Robinson, of Green Bay, a leading member of the Democratic party, formerly Secretary of State, a gentleman of good standing in his party, in a late number of the Green Bay *Advocate*, of which he is editor, uses the following language:

"We cannot rest satisfied with keeping a
'silence, which might be construed into con-
'sent, with the monstrous doctrine that slavery
'is legal, and exists throughout all the land, ex-
'cept where it has actually been prohibited by
'Congressional or State legislation. That is
'the natural sequence of the President's posi-
'tion in asserting that 'the right has been es-
'tablished (by the Supreme Court) of every
'citizen to take his property of every kind, in-
'cluding slaves, into the common Territories,
'belonging equally to all the States of the Con-
'federacy, and to have it protected there under
'the Federal Constitution.' This is a perver-
'sion, in fact a violation, of the doctrine of pop-
'ular sovereignty, through which President Bu-
'chanan got the vote of the Democracy in these
'Northern States; and we shall no more up-
'hold him in secession from it, than we would
'the humblest man in the party. Every Dem-
'ocrat is willing that, in populating a new Ter-
'ritory, prior to the settling of its domestic
'questions, slavery men, even slaveholders,
'shall have an equal right with all to go there
'and acquire the right to vote; but it is too
'monstrous a proposition to be entertained for
'a moment, that the very institution, which is
'to be the cause of all the struggle, may, be-
'fore its right upon the disputed soil is passed
'upon, be admitted and set up in practical
'operation."

Mr. Robinson, who uses the above language, was a prominent Democratic candidate for the nomination for Governor at the late election. He has more ability and honesty than the average of Wisconsin Democratic politicians. But my colleague does not dare to endorse the opinion of Mr. Robinson above expressed, as he well knows that every southern Democrat would scout him should he do so, and send him into Coventry.

Mr. Chairman, for the first two months of this session this House was entertained, day after day, with speeches from Southern gentlemen, declaring that if a majority of the people of this Union should, under the forms of law and the Constitution, elect a Republican President, they would dissolve the Union; that they would not submit; that he never should be inaugurated, and all that. Such was the tenor of most of the speeches made on the Democratic side of the House, and they were very numerous.

While all these speeches, preaching treason and disunion in most violent and insulting language, were being made by leading members of the Democratic party, where was my colleague? Did he utter one word of rebuke to a single man for any of those treasonable sentiments? Not a word; but, on the contrary, when any sentiment particularly offensive to the Republican side of the House, because of its disunion and treasonable character, was uttered, he has generally been noticed as first and foremost in leading the applause that invariably followed from the Democratic benches. So impressed had he become with those disunion speeches, that he declared that "the question of disunion was not one of time, but that disunion was now actually here." Considering what a horrible event a dissolution of the Union is supposed to be, I could not but

think that my colleague was rather jolly over it. He did not tell us where he was going in case of a dissolution, as some other Northern Representatives and Senators have. Should that melancholy event prove the means of his loss to Wisconsin, I presume that the disconsolate people there would become reconciled, upon hearing that their loss had resulted in a corresponding gain to Arkansas or Texas, where he could "expend his energies and intellect" in training Cuffy, Sambo, and Dinah.

My colleague finds fault with the Republican party, because, he says, "they always appeal to the Declaration of Independence, that all men are created equal." He says that "that is a mere abstract statement;" and that Jefferson never meant that all men were created equal. As he was more than usually lucid in his exposition of the Declaration of Independence, I think I will read what he says upon that subject. Here it is:

"Gentlemen on the other side of the House, 'and Republican orators at the North, always 'appeal to the Declaration of Independence— 'that all men are created equal; and they go 'on to argue from that directly and positively, 'that these black men were intended to be in- 'cluded in that Declaration, and to be incor- 'porated as citizens under this system of Gov- 'ernment of ours. Now, sir, this is a mere ab- 'stract statement. It could not have been that 'Jefferson meant that all men could have been 'created with equal rights under any particu- 'lar form of Government; for we know that 'government does not proceed directly from 'God, but is the result of human thought, hu- 'man intellect, and human will. What did he 'mean? It is true they are equal in the sight 'of God; they bear the same relation to time 'and eternity that we all do, but they are not 'created with equal political rights, and it was 'never so intended."

As Captain Cuttle would say: "There's wisdom for you."

"It is true," says my colleague, "they are 'equal in the sight of God, they bear the same 'relation to time and eternity;" but God did not intend they should be equal in the sight of man; and the reason is, because Government does not proceed from God. Could anything be clearer than this? It is "clear as mud."

As to whether Jefferson, who framed the Declaration, meant what he said, or whether he meant something else, can be best judged from reading his opinions on slavery, some of which I have here, and presently will read.

A prominent politician—Mr. DOUGLAS—has interpreted the Declaration to mean simply that God had created such British subjects as lived on this side of the water in 1776 as equal to British subjects living in Great Britain—nothing more. This interpretation is about such as was to be expected of a man who declared that he did not care whether "slavery in the Territories was voted up or down." As my colleague believes the Declaration of Independence to mean anything else than what it purports to mean, I will allow Mr. Jefferson, who was the author of it, to say whether he intended that the people of color then residing in this country were to be regarded as men or not. We know that in many of the States they were then regarded as citizens, and allowed to vote. Before the Declaration, and while Virginia was yet a colony, in 1774, she held a Convention to appoint delegates to attend the first general Congress, which was to assemble, and did assemble, in Philadelphia, in September of the same year. Before that Convention, Mr. Jefferson made an exposition of the rights of British America, in which he said:

"The abolition of domestic slavery is the 'great object of desire in these colonies, where 'it was unhappily introduced in their infant 'state. But previous to the enfranchisement 'of the slaves, it is necessary to exclude further 'importations from Africa."

In the original draft of the Declaration of Independence, of which it is well known he was the author, we find this charge against the King of Great Britain:

"He has waged cruel war against human 'nature itself, violating its most sacred rights 'of life and liberty in the persons of a distant 'people, who never offended him, captivating 'and carrying them into slavery in another 'hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in 'their transportation thither. This piratical 'warfare, the opprobrium of infidel Powers, is 'the warfare of the Christian King of Great 'Britain. Determined to keep a market where 'men should be bought and sold, he has at 'length prostituted his negative for suppressing 'any legislative attempt to prohibit and restrain 'this execrable commerce."

Hear him further; he says:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: 'that all men are created equal; that they are 'endowed by their Creator with certain inalien- 'able rights; that among these are life, liberty, 'and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure 'these rights, Governments are instituted 'among men, deriving their just powers from 'the consent of the governed."

Under date of August 7, 1785, in a letter to Dr. Price, of London, he says:

"Northward of the Chesapeake, you may 'find, here and there, an opponent of your doc- 'trine, as you may find here and there a rob- 'ber and murderer; but in no great number. 'Emancipation is put into such a train, that in 'a few years there will be no slaves northward 'of Maryland. In Maryland, I do not find such 'a disposition to begin the redress of this enor- 'mity as in Virginia. This is the next State 'to which we may turn our eyes for the inter- 'esting spectacle of justice in conflict with 'avarice and oppression; a conflict wherein 'the sacred side is gaining daily recruits from 'the influx into office of young men grown

'up and growing up. These have sucked in 'the principles of liberty, as it were, with their 'mothers' milk; and it is to them I look with 'anxiety to turn the fate of the question."

In another letter, written to a friend in 1814, he made use of the following language:

"Your favor of July 31 was duly received, 'and read with peculiar pleasure. The senti- 'ments do honor to the head and heart of the 'writer. Mine on the subject of the slavery of 'negroes have long since been in the posses- 'sion of the public, and time has only served 'to give them stronger root. The love of jus- 'tice and the love of country plead equally the 'cause of these people, and it is a reproach to 'us that they should have pleaded it so long in 'vain."

Again he says:

"What an incomprehensible machine is 'man, who can endure toil, famine, stripes, 'imprisonment, and death itself, in vindication 'of his own liberty, and the next moment be 'deaf to all those motives whose power sup- 'ported him through his trial, and inflict on 'his fellow-man a bondage, one hour of which 'is fraught with more misery than ages of that 'which he rose in rebellion to oppose?

"We must wait with patience the workings 'of an overruling Providence, and hope that 'that is preparing the deliverance of these our '*brethren*. When the measure of their tears 'shall be full, when their groans shall have in- 'volved heaven itself in darkness, doubtless a 'God of justice will awaken to their distress. 'Nothing is more certainly written in the book 'of fate, than that this people shall be free."

In a letter to James Heaton, on this same subject, dated May 20, 1826, only six weeks before his death, he says:

"My sentiments have been forty years be- 'fore the public. Had I repeated them forty 'times, they would have only become the more 'stale and threadbare. Although I shall not 'live to see them consummated, they will not 'die with me."

On the 39th and 40th pages of his Notes on Virginia, Jefferson says:

"And with what execration should the states- 'man be loaded, who, permitting one half the '*citizens* thus to trample on the rights of the 'other, transforms those into despots and these 'into enemies, destroys the morals of the one 'part, and the *amor patriæ* of the other; for if 'a slave can have a country in this world, it 'must be any other in preference to that in 'which he is born to live and labor for another; 'in which he must lock up the faculties of his 'nature, contribute, as far as depends on his 'individual endeavors, to the evanishment of 'the human race, or entail his own miserable 'condition on the endless generations proceed- 'ing from him."

It will thus be seen that Mr. Jefferson not only speaks of the colored people as "citizens," but also as "brethren."

As my colleague has declared himself in favor of slavery and holding slaves, and believes it morally right to do so, it may not be out of place to commend further to him a few more opinions of the early fathers of the Republic; such men as Washington, Madison, Monroe, and others.

In a letter to John F. Mercer, dated September 9, 1786, General Washington says:

"I never mean, unless some particular cir- 'cumstances should compel me to it, to pos- 'sess another slave by purchase, it being among 'my *first wishes* to see some plan adopted by 'which slavery in this country may be abol- 'ished by law."

In a letter to Robert Morris, dated April 12, 1786, he says:

"I hope it will not be conceived from these 'observations that it is my wish to hold the un- 'happy people who are the subject of this let- 'ter in slavery. I can only say, that there is 'not a man living who wishes more sincerely 'than I do to see a plan adopted for the aboli- 'tion of it; but there is only one proper and 'effectual mode by which it can be accom- 'plished, and that is by legislative authority; 'and this, as far as my suffrage will go, shall 'never be wanting."

He says, in a letter to the Marquis de La Fayette, April 5, 1783:

"The scheme, my dear Marquis, which you 'propose as a precedent, to encourage the 'emancipation of the black people in this coun- 'try from the state of bondage in which they 'are held, is a striking evidence of the benevo- 'lence of your heart. I shall be happy to join 'you in so laudable a work, but will defer going 'into a detail of the business till I have the 'pleasure of seeing you."

In another letter to La Fayette, he says:

"The benevolence of your heart, my dear 'Marquis, is so conspicuous on all occasions, 'that I never wonder at any fresh proofs of it; 'but your late purchase of an estate in the 'colony of Cayenne, with the view of emanci- 'pating the slaves on it, is a generous and noble 'proof of your humanity. Would to God a like 'spirit might diffuse itself generally into the 'minds of the people of this country."

I could quote the opinions of Washington to much greater length, and all to the same effect, but time will not allow me to do so.

Mr. Madison, the father of the Constitution, declared that he

"Thought it wrong to admit in the Constitu- 'tion the idea that there could be property in 'men."

Advocating the abolition of the slave trade, as we find in the forty-second number of the Federalist, he said:

"It were doubtless to be wished that the 'power of prohibiting the importation of slaves 'had not been postponed until the year 1808, 'or, rather, that it had been suffered to have 'immediate operation.

"But it is not difficult to account either for 'this restriction on the General Government, 'or for the manner in which the whole clause 'is expressed. It ought to be considered as a 'great point gained in favor of humanity, that 'a period of twenty years may terminate for-'ever, within these States, a traffic which has 'so long and so loudly upbraided the barba-'rism of modern policy; that within that period 'it will receive a considerable discouragement 'from the Federal Government, and may be 'totally abolished by a concurrence of the few 'States which continue the unnatural traffic, in 'the prohibitory example which has been given 'by so great a majority of the Union."

Again, he contends that—

"Where slavery exists, the republican theory 'becomes still more fallacious."

On another occasion, he says:

"We have seen the mere distinction of color 'made, in the most enlightened period of time, 'a ground of the most oppressive dominion ever 'exercised by man over man."

President Monroe, in a speech in the Virginia Convention, declared:

"That they had found that this evil had 'preyed upon the very vitals of the Union, and 'had been prejudicial to all the States in which 'it had existed."

Patrick Henry, Virginia's greatest orator and patriot, in a letter dated January 18, 1773, asks:

"Is it not a little surprising that the professors 'of Christianity, whose chief excellence consists 'in softening the human heart, in cherishing and 'improving its finer feelings, should encourage 'a practice so totally repugnant to the first 'impressions of right and wrong? What adds 'to the wonder is, that this abominable prac-'tice has been introduced in the most enlight-'ened ages. Times that seem to have pre-'tensions to boast of high improvements in 'the arts and sciences, and refined morality, 'have brought into general use, and guarded 'by many laws, a species of violence and tyran-'ny which our more rude and barbarous, but 'more honest, ancestors detested."

Again, this great orator says:

"It would rejoice my very soul that every one 'of my fellow-beings was emancipated. We 'ought to lament and deplore the necessity of 'holding our fellow-men in bondage. Believe 'me, I shall honor the Quakers for their noble 'efforts to abolish slavery."

On the 20th of October, 1774, while Congress was in session in Philadelphia, Peyton Randolph, President, the following resolution, among others, was unanimously adopted:

"That we will neither import nor purchase 'any slaves imported after the 1st day of De-'cember next; after which time, we will wholly 'discontinue the slave trade, and will neither 'be concerned in it ourselves, nor will we hire 'our vessels, nor sell our commodities or man-'ufactures, to those who are concerned in it."

"On motion of Mr. Randolph, the word '*ser-'vitude*' was struck out, and '*service*' unani-'mously inserted; the former being thought to 'express the condition of *slaves*, and the latter 'the obligation of *free* persons."—*Madison Papers, vol. 3, p.* 1569.

That very eccentric genius, John Randolph, of Roanoke, in a letter to William Gibbons, in 1820, says:

"With unfeigned respect and regard, and as 'sincere a deprecation on the extension of sla-'very and its horrors as any other man, be he 'who he may, I am your friend, in the literal 'sense of that much-abused word. I say much-'abused, because it is applied to the leagues 'of vice and avarice and ambition, instead of 'good will toward man, from love of Him who 'is the Prince of Peace."

While in Congress, he said:

"Sir, I envy neither the heart nor the head of 'that man from the North who rises here to 'defend slavery on principle."

It is well known that he emancipated all his negroes. The following lines from his will are well worth perusing and preserving:

"I give to my slaves their freedom, to which 'my conscience tells me they are justly entitled. 'It has a long time been a matter of the deep-'est regret to me, that the circumstances under 'which I inherited them, and the obstacles 'thrown in the way by the laws of the land, 'have prevented my emancipating them in my 'lifetime, which it is my full intention to do in 'case I can accomplish it."

Colonel Mason, a leading and distinguished member of the Convention that formed the Constitution, from Virginia, when the provision for prohibiting the importation of slaves was under consideration, said:

"The present question concerns not the im-'porting States alone, but the whole Union. 'Slavery discourages arts and manufactures. 'The poor despise labor when performed by 'slaves. They prevent the emigration of 'whites, who really enrich and strengthen a 'country. They produce the most pernicious 'effect on manners. Every master of slaves is 'born a petty tyrant. They bring the judg-'ment of Heaven on a country. As nations 'cannot be rewarded or punished in the next 'world, they must be in this. By an inevitable 'chain of causes and effects, Providence pun-'ishes national sins by national calamities."

In 1832, Governor McDowell used this language in the Virginia Legislature:

"Who that looks to this unhappy bondage 'of an unhappy people, in the midst of our 'society, and thinks of its incidents or issues, 'but weeps over it as a curse as great upon 'him who inflicts it as upon him who suffers 'it?

"Sir, you may place the slave where you 'please; you may dry up, to your utmost, the 'fountains of his feelings, the springs of his 'thought; you may close upon his mind every

'avenue to knowledge, and cloud it over with 'artificial night; you may yoke him to your 'labors as the ox which liveth only to work, 'and worketh only to live; you may put him 'under any process, which, without destroying 'his value as a slave, will debase and crush 'him as a rational being; you may do this, 'and the idea that he was born to be free will 'survive it all. It is allied to his hope of im-'mortality; it is the ethereal part of his nature, 'which oppression cannot reach; it is a torch 'lit up in his soul by the hand of Deity, and 'never meant to be extinguished by the hand 'of man."

And, to come down to a later period; what was the opinion of some of Virginia's wise men no longer ago than 1832? In an address to the Virginia Legislature in 1820, Governor Randolph said:

"We have been far outstripped by States to 'whom nature has been far less bountiful. It 'is painful to consider what might have been, 'under other circumstances, the amount of 'general wealth in Virginia."

In 1832, Mr. Randolph, of Albemarle, in the Legislature of Virginia, used the following most graphic aad emphatic language:

* * * "Slavery has the effect of lessen-'ing the free population of a country."

"The gentleman has spoken of the increase 'of the female slaves being a part of the profit. 'It is admitted; but no great evil can be avert-'ed, no good attained, without some incon-'venience. It may be questioned how far it is 'desirable to foster and encourage this branch 'of profit. It is a practice, and an increasing 'practice, in parts of Virginia, to rear slaves 'for market. How can an honorable mind, a 'patriot, and a lover of his country, bear to see 'this ancient Dominion, rendered illustrious by 'the noble devotion and patriotism of her sons 'in the cause of liberty, converted into one 'grand menagerie, where men are to be reared 'for the market, like oxen for the shambles? 'Is it better, is it not worse, than the slave 'trade—that trade which enlisted the labor of 'the good and wise of every creed and every 'clime to abolish it? The trader receives the 'slave, a stranger in language, aspect, and 'manner, from the merchant who has brought 'him from the interior. The ties of father, 'mother, husband, and child, have all been 'rent in twain; before he receives him, his soul 'has become callous. But here, sir, individuals 'whom the master has known from infancy, 'whom he has seen sporting in the innocent 'gambols of childhood, who have been accus-'tomed to look to him for protection, he tears 'from the mother's arms, and sells into a 'strange country, among strange people, sub-'ject to cruel taskmasters."

I will quote the opinions of but one other man, and he a man whose memory all now delight to honor. Notwithstanding the Democracy in his lifetime hunted him with a malignity only equalled by their present hypocrisy, they now set themselves up as his original friends and warmest admirers, and when engaged in any outrage of more than ordinary baseness, are almost certain, now that he has gone, to invoke his great name as sanctioning their crimes. I need not say that I allude to glorious old Harry Clay, of Kentucky. In the Senate of the United States, in 1850, he made use of this memorable language:

"I am extremely sorry to hear the Senator 'from Mississippi say that he requires, first, 'the extension of the Missouri compromise 'line to the Pacific, and also that he is not 'satisfied with that, but requires, if I under-'stand him correctly, a positive provision for 'the admission of slavery south of that line. 'And now, sir, coming from a slave State, as 'I do, I owe it to myself, I owe it to truth, I 'owe it to the subject, to say that no earthly 'power could induce me to vote for a specific 'measure for the introduction of slavery where 'it had not before existed, either south or 'north of that line. Coming, as I do, from a 'slave State, it is my solemn, deliberate, and 'well-matured determination, that no power, 'no earthly power, shall compel me to vote 'for the positive introduction of slavery either 'south or north of that line.

"Sir, while you reproach, and justly, too, 'our British ancestors for the introduction of 'this institution upon the continent of America, 'I am, for one, unwilling that the posterity of 'the present inhabitants of California and of 'New Mexico shall reproach us for doing just 'what we reproach Great Britain for doing to 'us."

Hear him further. He says:

"So long as God allows the vital current to 'flow through my veins, I will never, never, 'never, by word or thought, by mind or will, 'aid in admitting one rood of free territory to 'the everlasting curse of human bondage."

But, Mr. Chairman, great minds will differ. On the one hand, we have the opinions of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Randolph, Henry, and Clay, denouncing slavery as a great moral wrong; and on the other hand, we have the member from the third Congressional district of Wisconsin declaring it to be right. Anxious as I might be, under ordinary circumstances, to agree with my colleague, I am constrained to say that I shall feel obliged to continue to follow the teachings of these great lights of American liberty, and that his very luminous speech has not convinced me of my error. I must still continue to regard slavery as a great social and political evil, and labor to repress it, so far as I lawfully may do so.

PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN OF 1860.

REPUBLICAN EXECUTIVE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE.

HON. PRESTON KING, N. Y., *Chairman.*
" J. W. GRIMES, IOWA.
" L. F. S. FOSTER, CONN.
On the part of the Senate.
" E. B. WASHBURNE, ILLINOIS.

HON. JOHN COVODE, PENN., *Treasurer.*
" E. G. SPAULDING, N. Y.
" J. B. ALLEY, MASS.
" DAVID KILGORE, INDIANA.
" J. L. N. STRATTON, N. J.
On the part of the House of Reps.

The Committee are prepared to furnish the following Speeches and Documents:

EIGHT PAGES.

Hon. W. H. Seward: State of the Country.
" W. H. Seward: "Irrepressible Conflict" Speech.
" G. A. Grow, Penn.: Free Homes for Free Men.
" James Harlan, Iowa: Shall the Territories be Africanized?
" John Hickman, Penn.: Who have Violated Compromises.
" B. F. Wade, Ohio: Invasion of Harper's Ferry.
" G. W. Scranton and J. H. Campbell, Penn.: The Speakership.
" F. P. Blair, Mo., Address at Cincinnati: Colonization and Commerce.
" Orris S. Ferry, Conn.
" Abraham Lincoln, Ill.: The Demands of the South—The Republican Party Vindicated.
" William Windom, Minn.: The Homestead Bill—Its Friends and its Foes.
" Owen Lovejoy, of Illinois: The Barbarism of Slavery.
" Henry L. Dawes, Mass.: The New Dogma of the South—"Slavery a Blessing."
" R. H. Duell, N. Y.: The Position of Parties.
" M. S. Wilkinson, Minn.: The Homestead Bill.
" D. W. Gooch, Mass.: Polygamy in Utah.
Carl Schurz, Wis.: Douglas and Popular Sovereignty.
Lands for the Landless—A Tract.
The Poor Whites of the South—The Injury done them by Slavery—A Tract.

SIXTEEN PAGES.

Hon. Lyman Trumbull, Ill.: Seizure of the Arsenals at Harper's Ferry, Va. and Liberty, Mo., and in Vindication of the Republican Party.
" B. F. Wade, Ohio: Property in the Territories.
" C. H. Van Wyck, N. Y.: True Democracy—History Vindicated.
Hon. H. Wilson, Mass.: Territorial Slave Code.
" John P. Hale, N. H.
" J. J. Perry, Me.: "Posting the Books between the North and the South."
" J. R. Doolittle, Wis.: The Calhoun Revolution—Its Basis and its Progress.
" C. B. Sedgwick, N. Y.: The Republican Party the Result of Southern Aggression.
" M. J. Parrott, Kansas: Admission of Kansas.
Federalism Unmasked: Or the Rights of the States, the Congress, the Executive, and the People, Vindicated against the Encroachments of the Judiciary, prompted by the Modern Apostate Democracy. Being a Compilation from the Writings and Speeches of the Leaders of the Old Jeffersonian Republican Party. By Daniel R. Goodloe.

TWENTY-FOUR PAGES.

Hon. Jacob Collamer, Vermont.

THIRTY-TWO PAGES.

Hon. Thomas Corwin, of Ohio.

GERMAN.

EIGHT PAGES.

Hon. G. A. Grow, Penn.: Free Homes for Free Men.
" James Harlan, Iowa: Shall the Territories be Africanized?
" John Hickman, Penn.: Who Have Violated Compromises.
" William Windom, Minn.: The Homestead Bill—Its Friends and its Foes.
" H. Winter Davis, Md.: Election of Speaker.
Carl Schurz, Wis.: Douglas and Popular Sovereignty.

SIXTEEN PAGES.

Hon. Lyman Trumbull, Ill.: Seizure of the Arsenals at Harper's Ferry, Va., and Liberty, Mo., and in Vindication of the Republican Party.
" W. H. Seward, N. Y.: The State of the Country.
Lands for the Landless—A Tract.

And all the leading Republican Speeches as delivered.

During the Presidential Campaign, Speeches and Documents will be supplied at the following reduced prices: per 100—8 pages 50 cents, 16 pages $1, and larger documents in proportion. Address either of the above Committee.

GEORGE HARRINGTON, *Secretary.*

71.2009.084.00904